

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.: 10/676,590

Filing Date: October 1, 2003

Applicant: Sig H. Badt, Jr.

Group Art Unit: 2626

Examiner: Jesse S. Pullias

Title: MULTI-MODAL INPUT FORM WITH DICTIONARY AND GRAMMAR

Attorney Docket: 129250-002273/US

Remarks in Support of Pre-Appeal Brief Conference

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

February 4, 2010

Dear Sir/Madam:

The following remarks are submitted in conjunction with the filing of a Pre-Appeal Brief Request For Review (“Request”) and Notice of Appeal. No amendments are filed herein or in conjunction with the Request.

On December 4, 2009 a Final Office Action was mailed. The Final Office Action finally rejected claims 1, 5, 11, 12, 19 and 22-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and separately rejected claims 4, 11 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). No claims were allowed. Of the rejected claims, claims 1, 8 and 15 are independent claims.

The Appellant submits that there are clear errors in the Final Rejection of claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, 15, 18, 19 and 22-27 and, therefore, request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of these claims.

REMARKS

A. The Section 103 Rejections Based on Groner and Bissonnette

Claims 1, 5, 8, 12, 15, 19 and 22-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on the combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,668,928 to Groner (“Groner”) and U.S. Patent No. 5,602,963 to Bissonnette et al. (“Bissonnette”). Appellant respectfully disagrees for at least the following reasons.

Of the rejected claims, claims 1, 8 and 15 are independent claims. It is to these claims that Appellant now turns, it being understood that the remarks which follow apply equally to the remaining claims.

Claim 1 includes the features of a user interface, wherein upon selection of one field and receipt of a recognized command spoken by a user, the user interface displays a list of recognized input terms in a pull-down menu that are appropriate for input into the selected field. Contrary to the Examiner’s position, Groner does not disclose or suggest these features.

The Examiner again directs the Appellant’s attention to column 7 and Figures 4A and B of Groner as purportedly disclosing the features above. This excerpt from Groner appears to disclose “pull down menus” 210, 212 and “speech recognition procedures” 156, including a “Voice Tool” 170. However,

this excerpt does not explicitly describe the display of a pull down menu after the selection of a field and receipt of a spoken, user command.

In the Final Office Action the Examiner takes the position that the pull down menus displayed in Figure 4B are created after a user sees the pull down menus in Figure 4A and utters the word “Arrange”.

However, this description (i.e., of how Figure 4B is created) is not set forth in Groner.

To begin, Groner is concerned with the ability to utter “Content Words” (e.g., nouns, pronouns) and “Non-Content Words” (prepositions, articles such as “a”, “an” and “the” and conjunctions) instead of typing these words out using a keyboard. In contrast, the words in Figures 4A and B are neither Content nor Non-Content Words. Instead, the words in Figures 4A and B relate to functions that may be carried out, such as “File, Edit, Layout, Arrange” on a tool or task bar and “New, Open, Save, Save As” in a drop-down menu.

In sum, it does not appear to the Appellant that the drop-down menus in Figure 4B are created after a user utters the word “Arrange” upon viewing the tool bar in Figure 4A.

For the sake of argument, however, and without admitting the same, even if Groner can be interpreted as set forth in the Final Office Action the Appellant submits that Groner still does not disclose a user interface that displays a list of recognized input terms in a pull-down menu that are appropriate for input into a selected field after receipt of a recognized command spoken by a user. Rather, the words in the tool bar (pull down menus) of

Figures 4A and B appear to be related to functions that can be selected; they do not appear to be terms that are “input into a selected field”.

Similarly, Groner does not disclose instructions for “causing [a] user interface to display a list of recognized input terms for inputting into [a] selected field if at least one word is recognized as a command”, as in claim 8.

Turning to claim 15, it includes similar features as claim 1 and 8 though described as a part of a method. For example, claim 15 includes the feature of “...causing a user interface to display a list of recognized input terms for inputting into a selected field”. For the reasons set forth above regarding claims 1 and 8, the Appellant submits that Groner fails to disclose the features of claim 15.

Nor does Bissonnette make up for the deficiencies of Groner.

The Appellant respectfully requests that the Board reverse the decision of the Examiner, withdraw the rejections and allow claims 1, 5, 8, 12, 15, 19 and 22-27.

B.) The Section 103 Rejections Based on Groner, Bissonnette and Vanbuskirk

Claims 4, 11 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on the combination of Groner, Bissonnette and U.S. Patent No. 6,308,157 to Vanbuskirk et al (“Vanbuskirk”). Appellant respectfully disagrees for at least the following reasons.

Because claims 4, 11 and 18 are dependent on either 1, 8 or 15 and because Vanbuskirk does not make up for the deficiencies of Groner and

Bissonnette, the Appellant submits that claims 4, 11 and 18 are patentable over Groner, Bissonnette and Vanbuskirk for the reasons set forth above regarding claims 1, 8 and/or 15.

Accordingly, the Appellant respectfully requests that the Board reverse the decision of the Examiner, withdraw the rejections and allow claims 4, 11 and 18.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application the Board or Examiner is respectfully requested to contact John E. Curtin at the telephone number listed below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3777 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

CAPITOL PATENT & TRADEMARK LAW FIRM, PLLC.

By: /John E. Curtin/

John E. Curtin, Reg. No. 37,602
P.O. Box 1995
Vienna, Virginia 22183
(703) 266-3330